

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed May 8, 2007 has been carefully considered.  
Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robins et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,430,184). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robins et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,430,184) in view of Troxel et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,014,381). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Robins does not disclose following features, as set forth in current claims 1 and 2:  
packetizing modules 13 receive an order of end of packet make-up from a message composition module 13, as described in page 9, lines 3-5.

Said feature is claimed in claim 1: “after sending of a request by a message composition module, ending said first packetizing cycle in packetizing modules” and in claim 2: “a message composition module receiving...is completed”.

The passages of Robins (column 7, lines 8-113, and column 8, lines 8-57) cited by the Examiner in page 3, lines 10-18 do not disclose such a feature. So, in column 8, line 32, Robins states that “in operation 351, a packet is received at an MII (Media Independent Interface) and is split at operation 352 into cells by MOM 10 or 20...”. A MII, as shown in figures 1 and 2 of Robins is not a message composition module but rather is a “MII interface 65 providing eight duplexed Ethernet ports”. Thus, as described at column 7, lines 62-66, the MII is merely a link that transmits information. It does not construct a message. Thus, the interface is not a “message composition module”. In addition, Robins states that “in operation 351, a packet is received...”. However, a packet is not a message. As described in applicant’s specification at page 3, lines 6-7, a message is made up of successive packets in a predefined order.

Further, as stated in column 1, lines 22-27, Robins relates to the networking of data processing systems, and more particularly, to the switchable connection of LANs such as those

supported by the Ethernet protocol, the switchable connection of WANs such as those supported by the ATM protocol.

Robins, as explained in column 1, lines 28-36, seeks to resolve problems relating to the facts that:

- different networks protocols used to communicate between data processing systems on particular networks makes communication between said networks difficult,
- most network protocols require considerable configuration of parameters when adding computer systems or nodes.

By comparison, the presently-claimed invention as explained in page 2, lines 11-25, in page 3, lines 11-22, and in page 4, lines 8-15, seeks to solve the following technical problem:

In the field of data acquisition and telemetry of flight testing installations, the numerical or digital data, conveyed on continuous and cyclic messages, issued by acquisition and processing systems which arrives in a totally asynchronous manner, is stored in the FIFO as and when it arrives.

A module for packeting places data from these FIFO according to a predefined order. A packet thus obtained is therefore a group of data with a precise format and containing data in a precise order.

The operating cycle of the packeting module is self-sustaining. When the message composition module needs a packet, it sends a request to the packeting module which transmits the packet if it is made up. If not, it sends nothing or else an empty packet so as not to block the message composition module. The data is transmitted when the data arrives, it is put into packets by the packating module. The message can contain no data, solely because the packeting has not been finished.

So, the aim of the invention is to solve these technical problems, by enabling:

- transmission of the maximum amount of data in the output message,
- controlling transmission time of the acquired data,
- having the greatest possible ratio for the number of acquired/wrapped data in the packet.

**Conclusion**


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,  
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: 08/07/2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Khaled Shami  
Reg. No. 38,745

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040